

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-15 and rejected same. With this paper, no claims are amended, added or cancelled so that claims 1-15 are now pending.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103

At part 3 of the Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-11 & 14-15 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent publication 2003/0174160 (hereinafter Deutscher) in view of US patent publication 2004/0130566 (hereinafter Banerjee).

As to independent claims 1, 5 & 11 relying on Deutscher Figure 8 and paras. 62-65, the Office asserts that Deutscher teaches "assembling in a first column a plurality of objects of a slide that are to be displayed successively one after the other when a multimedia presentation is played on a communication or computing terminal having a display device, and also assembling in a second column any and all objects of the slide that are to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-side with any of the objects of the first column when the presentation is played, and displaying at the same time the first and second column side-by-side on the display device in the same horizontal arrangement as the objects will be displayed when the presentation is played" (emphasis added). The subject claims also require that the display be provided in such a way as to allow editing. For the editing, the Office relies on Banerjee.

The invention as claimed is most quickly apprehended by reference to Figure 2, showing a multimedia presentation of a plurality of slides, each of which includes various media

components, including text, images, and an audio clip. According to the invention, the different displayable media components, i.e. the text and images, but not the audio, are provided in different columns, to facilitate editing. Importantly, according to the invention as claimed and in particular according to the example illustrated in Figure 2, if in the actual playing of a slide of the presentation, if some text is to be displayed the entire time the slide is displayed but several different images are displayed, in succession, during actual playing, all the images are displayed by the invention, in one column, one on top of the other, and the (fixed or constant) text is displayed in another column beside the column displaying the images. When the presentation is actually played, though, the screen viewed by a user will display the text for the slide the entire time the slide displays, and will display the images, one after the other, so that only one image is displayed on the screen at any one time. (See Figure 3.)

Deutscher at paras. 62-65 teaches a "window layout" of an interactive presentation viewing system, i.e. a screen having several different windows. The window layout described at paras. 62-65 is not explained as including a column including a plurality of objects that are to be displayed successively, one after the other, during a presentation. Importantly, what is described in Deutscher is a "playback space" window 204, also referred to as a presentation video sector window, for viewing a "video presentation," and a "slide presentation sector" window 214 "for displaying presentation slides associated with the video presentation." The screen may have other windows, including a video selector window 202, and a video player controls area window 208. Deutshcer further discloses a window for automatically displaying the transcript segment associated

the portion of the program then being played in the presentation video sector/ playback space, as indicated by an elapsed running time assigned to the segment.

What Deutscher therefore discloses is a window layout for playing a presentation including an audio or video presentation, and does not provide in one column a plurality of objects of a slide that are to be displayed one after the other when a presentation is played, and in another column, any and all objects of the slide that are to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-side with any of the objects of the first column when the presentation is played, as required by the independent claims. For this, Deutscher would have to teach displaying all the frames of the video clip in one portion of the screen all at the same time (and also all of the transcript).

As Deutscher fails to teach or suggest the invention as in the subject claims, except for the enabling editing.

Although the Office does not rely upon Banerjee except for the limitation of displaying a slide for editing, Applicant observes that Bannerjee fails to disclose displaying parallel columns of sequential slide objects, as required by the subject claims. Rather, Banerjee Figure 4 teaches 3D Actors having various associated linear event triggers. Although the 3d Actors may be toggled on and off, this is clearly not the same as "assembling in a second column any and all objects of the slide that are to be displayed in parallel with and side-by-side with any of the objects of the first column when the presentation is played." There is simply no teaching or suggestion of the columns 3d Actors configured for sequential parallel viewing. Indeed, in order for two or more 3d Actors to be displayed in parallel, the user-configurable 3d Actor events would have to occupy at least a portion of the same column.

As no combination of applied references teaches or suggests each limitation of the independent claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

February 11, 2008\_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Respectfully submitted,  
/James A. Retter/\_\_\_\_\_

*Registration No.* 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234  
Cust. No.: 004955